

1 HULETT HARPER STEWART LLP
 2 BLAKE MUIR HARPER, SBN: 115756
 3 KIRK B. HULETT; SBN: 110726
 4 550 West C Street, Suite 1600
 5 San Diego, CA 92101
 6 Telephone: (619) 338-1133
 7 Facsimile: (619) 338-1139

8 Counsel for Movants Westchester Capital
 9 Management, Inc. and Green & Smith
 10 Investment Management L.L.C.
 11 [Additional Counsel on Signature Page]

12 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 13 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

14 HCL PARTNERS LIMITED
 15 PARTNERSHIP, On behalf of Itself and all
 16 others similarly situated,

17 Plaintiff,

18 -v-

19 LEAP WIRELESS INTERNATIONAL,
 20 INC., S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, DEAN
 21 M. LUVISA, AMIN I. KHALIFA and
 22 PRICEWATERHOUSECOOPERS, LLP,

23 Defendants.

24 FRANK CHAREK, Individually and on
 25 behalf of all others similarly situated,

26 Plaintiff,

27 -v-

28 LEAP WIRELESS INTERNATIONAL,
 29 INC., S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, MARK
 30 H. RACHESKY, AMIN I. KHALIFA,
 31 GLENN UMETSU, and DEAN M. LUVISA,

32 Defendants.

33 [Caption continued on next page]

34 Case No.: 07-cv-2245-BTM-NLS

35 **CLASS ACTION**

36 **REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT
 37 OF MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION**

38 DATE: August 15, 2008
 39 TIME: 11:00 a.m.
 40 JUDGE: Hon. Barry Ted Moskowitz
 41 CTRM: 15 (5th Floor)

42 Case No.: 07-cv-2256-BTM-NLS

1 DEVAY CAMPBELL, Individually and on
2 behalf of all others similarly situated,

3 Plaintiff,

4 -v-

5 LEAP WIRELESS INTERNATIONAL,
6 INC., S. DOUGLAS HUTCHESON, MARK
7 H. RACHESKY, AMIN I. KHALIFA,
GLENN UMETSU, and DEAN M. LUVISA,

8 Defendants.

Case No.: 07-cv-2297-BTM-NLS

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 Class Members Westchester Capital Management, Inc. and Green & Smith Investment
2 Management L.L.C. (together “Westchester Capital”) submit this reply memorandum in support of
3 their motion for reconsideration of the Court’s May 22, 2008 Order Granting Motions To
4 Consolidate, Appointing New Jersey Carpenters Pension and Benefit Fund As Lead Plaintiff, And
5 Approving Lead Counsel Selection (the “Lead Plaintiff Order”).

6 As discussed in detail in its opening brief, Westchester Capital believes that the Court erred
7 in rejecting its application to be appointed as lead plaintiff when Westchester Capital clearly had
8 greater losses than those of the competing movants and there was no evidence presented sufficient
9 to contradict the sworn statement of the Chief Compliance Officer of Westchester Capital that
10 Westchester Capital had the authority to seek to be appointed lead counsel.

11 In an effort to address any doubt as the authority of Westchester Capital, documents have
12 been prepared by the requisite persons and entities confirming that Westchester Capital did and
13 does have the authority to seek appointment as lead plaintiff in this and other cases alleging
14 violations of the securities laws in order to recover losses suffered by the underlying funds. The
15 documents, signed by the appropriate trustees and officers of the funds, attest to the longstanding
16 authority of Westchester Capital to take the actions it has taken and will continue to take to pursue
17 these types of claims. While the New Jersey Funds call these documents “manufactured” and
18 describes them as “purported resolutions,” the New Jersey Funds provide no substantive basis to
19 doubt the validity of each of the documents that has been submitted. These documents, submitted
20 with Westchester Capital’s motion, merely confirm what Mr. Behren testified to previously –
21 namely that Westchester Capital has “unrestricted decision-making authority with respect to the
22 funds they advise and manage”; that he was authorized to take all actions on behalf of the funds
23 “including the right to commence legal actions . . . and the right to seek to serve as lead plaintiff in
24 an action brought pursuant to the federal securities law”; and that Westchester Capital was
25 attorney-in-fact “to take all actions” on behalf of the funds. These types of documents were not
26 submitted previously because there was no evidence submitted by the New Jersey Funds in their
27 opposition briefs sufficient to cast doubt upon Mr. Behren’s assertions or otherwise to rebut the
28 presumption that Westchester Capital was the most adequate plaintiff.

1 The New Jersey Funds try to distinguish this case from the supplemental authority
2 submitted by Westchester Capital wherein Judge Pauley, on an identical record, appointed
3 Westchester Capital as the lead plaintiff in cases pending against the SLM Corporation (“Sallie
4 Mae”) in the Southern District of New York. The New Jersey Funds assert that the plaintiffs in
5 Sallie Mae submitted additional evidence in that case before the lead plaintiff motion was decided.
6 However, the lead plaintiff motion had already been fully briefed and argued at the time the
7 additional submission was made. The additional evidence in Sallie Mae (the same letters and
8 consents submitted here) was first provided to Judge Pauley because the competing movants in
9 Sallie Mae submitted this Court’s Lead Plaintiff Order in an effort to defeat Westchester Capital’s
10 lead plaintiff motion in Sallie Mae. Given that this Court had questioned the authority of
11 Westchester Capital, plaintiffs in Sallie Mae simply alerted the New York District Court to the fact
12 that Westchester Capital had moved for reconsideration here and provided a courtesy copy of the
13 motion for reconsideration which annexed each of the corporate documents confirming
14 Westchester Capital’s authority.

15 While the New Jersey Funds suggest, without any basis whatsoever, that the information
16 that has been submitted to the Court is somehow manufactured and insufficient, Westchester
17 Capital has been forthright with the Court and will continue to pursue its right to recover losses
18 suffered by the funds that it manages, which in this case dwarf the losses of the New Jersey Funds.
19 Westchester Capital is committed to making every effort to redress securities laws violations that
20 have resulted in losses to its clients and has filed this motion for reconsideration in a final attempt
21 to direct litigation in which it has the largest financial interest by far. Westchester Capital
22 continues to believe that the Court overlooked aspects of the sworn statements of Mr. Behren and
23 determined in error that these statements, made under penalty of perjury, were insufficient to
24 establish authority in the absence of any evidence to the contrary.

25

26

27

28

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and the reasons set forth in its opening brief, Westchester Capital respectfully requests that the Court reconsider that portion of the Lead Plaintiff Order that appointed the New Jersey Funds as the Lead Plaintiff and approved their selection of counsel.

DATED: August 8, 2008

HULETT HARPER STEWART LLP
BLAKE MUIR HARPER
KIRK B. HULETT

/s/Kirk B. Hulett

KIRK B. HULETT

550 West C Street, Suite 1600
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 338-1133
Facsimile: (619) 338-1139

ABBEY SPANIER RODD & ABRAMS, LLP
NANCY KABOOLIAN
KARIN E. FISCH
212 East 39th Street
New York, New York 10016
Telephone: (212) 889-3700
Facsimile: (212) 684-5191

Counsel for Movants Westchester Capital Management, Inc. and Green & Smith Investment Management L.L.C.